



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/050,733

01/16/2002

Paul Barry Pershan

Verizon-23

7734

32127

7590

06/16/2006

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3H14
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER

LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/050,733

Applicant(s)

PERSHAN, PAUL BARRY

Examiner

Andrew C. Lee

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 23-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 11, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. (US 6909708 B1) in view of Kung et al. (US 6678265 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of a method of servicing a telephone call directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device coupled (Fig. 10A, element 1050) to an Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, element 1060 INTERNET as internet Protocol network, recited “the directory service is required to identify the called PC” as directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device coupled to an Internet Protocol network; Fig. 10A, elements 1021, 1050, 1060; column 84, lines 40 – 57), the telephone call being placed from a telephone device coupled to a public telephone network by dialing a first telephone number associated with the Internet Protocol telephony device (recited “the caller has an E.164 address that is “constant” “ as telephone call being placed from a telephone device coupled to a public telephone network by dialing a first telephone number (E.164 address); “called PC” as Internet Protocol telephony device; column 84, lines 40 – 57), the method comprising the steps of activating a trigger set at a telephone switch (recited “an area code assigned” as activating a trigger set at a telephone switch; column 85, lines 9 – 10) included in said public telephone network, the trigger being

Art Unit: 2616

responsive to calls received by said telephone switch directed to said first telephone number (recited “legitimate area code the PSTN caller can directly dial the E.164 address of the PC on the Internet” as trigger being responsive to calls received by said telephone switch directed to said first telephone number; column 85, lines 11 – 13); pausing call processing at said telephone switch in response to activation of said trigger (column 85, lines 8 – 23); accessing a database maintained in said Internet Protocol network to obtain therefrom information associated with the first telephone number; and controlling completion of said call by said telephone switch as a function of the information obtained from said database (recited “a user profile will contain information that allows the Data Access Point (DAP) and Directory Service to make a determination whether to send an incoming call to the PC or to the telephone” as accessing a database maintained in said Internet Protocol network to obtain therefrom information associated with the first telephone number; and controlling completion of said call by said telephone switch as a function of the information obtained from said database; column 92, lines 38 – 63). However, Krishnaswamy et al. do not disclose explicitly using local number portability activating a local number portability trigger set at a first telephone switch included in said public telephone network, the local number portability trigger being responsive to calls received by said first telephone switch directed to said first telephone number; pausing call processing at said first telephone switch in response to activation of said local number portability trigger; accessing a local number portability database to obtain a number associated with a second telephone switch included in the public telephone network; activating a second trigger set at the second telephone switch, the second trigger being responsive to the calls received by said second telephone switch directed to said first telephone number. Kung et al. disclose the

Art Unit: 2616

limitation of activating a local number portability trigger set at a first telephone switch included in said public telephone network (recited “the off hook signal may act as a dial tone request to the call manager” as activating a local number portability trigger set at a first telephone switch; column 27, lines 48 – 50, 66 – 67, Fig. 6), the local number portability trigger being responsive to calls received by said first telephone switch directed to said first telephone number (recited “the IP local number portability database may then supply the call manager with a routing number , in this case, called number “ as local number portability trigger being responsive to calls received by said first telephone switch directed to said first telephone number; column 28, lines 2 – 4); pausing call processing at said first telephone switch in response to activation of said local number portability trigger (recited “on receiving the completed dialed digitals” as pausing call processing at said first telephone switch; column 27, lines 66 – 67); accessing a local number portability database to obtain a number associated with a second telephone switch included in the public telephone network (recited “the IP local number portability database may then supply the call manager with a routing number , in this case, called number “ as local number portability trigger being responsive to calls received by said first telephone switch directed to said first telephone number; Fig. 6, column 28, lines 2 – 4); activating a second trigger set at the second telephone switch, the second trigger being responsive to the calls received by said second telephone switch directed to said first telephone number (recited “the far-end broadband residential gateway may then send a ringing message to the far-end CMTS” as activating a second trigger set at the second telephone switch; Fig. 6, column 28, lines 29 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy et al. to include activating a local number portability trigger set at a

Art Unit: 2616

first telephone switch included in said public telephone network, the local number portability trigger being responsive to calls received by said first telephone switch directed to said first telephone number; pausing call processing at said first telephone switch in response to activation of said local number portability trigger; accessing a local number portability database to obtain a number associated with a second telephone switch included in the public telephone network; activating a second trigger set at the second telephone switch, the second trigger being responsive to the calls received by said second telephone switch directed to said first telephone number such as that taught by Kung et al. in order to provide broadband access capabilities or enhanced services for use in conjunction with a packetized network such as an Internet Protocol (IP) based system infrastructure (as suggested by Kung et al., see column 1, lines 36 – 39).

Regarding claim 2, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the obtained information includes call forwarding information (column 28, lines 23 – 30; column 80, lines 64 – 67; column 81, lines 1 – 9); and wherein the step of controlling completion of said call includes operating said second telephone switch to route said call using a second telephone number included in the obtained information (recited “the directory system maps that address to the Internet dial out unit based on the NPA-NXX” as operating said second telephone switch to route said call using a second telephone number included in the obtained information; column 83, lines 57 – 60).

Regarding claim 3, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the obtained information includes call forwarding information (recited “forwarding the

Art Unit: 2616

transaction to a generalized service-engine” as obtained information includes call forwarding information; column 28, lines 23 – 30; column 80, lines 64 – 67; column 81, lines 1 – 9).

Regarding claim 4, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the obtained information includes an Internet Protocol address; and wherein the step of controlling completion of said call includes operating said first telephone call to route said call using the IP address included in the obtained information (recited “would make their location (IP address) known to the directory system” as obtained information includes an Internet Protocol address; column 81, lines 2 – 9; lines 16 – 19; column 92, lines 50 – 58).

Regarding claim 5, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the obtained information includes call screening information (column 68, lines 43 – 48); and wherein the step of controlling completion of said call includes terminating said call without completing it to said telephone number when said call screening information indicates that the call will not be completed successfully by the Internet Protocol network to the Internet telephony device corresponding to the called number (recited “call screening” as call screening information; column 68, lines 44 – 64).

Regarding claim 8, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the call screening information includes calling party telephone number information (column 68, lines 43 – 48; column 244, lines 41 – 58).

Regarding claim 9, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein said trigger is an advanced intelligent network trigger (recited “call processing “ as trigger, “MCI Intelligent network call processing “ as an advanced intelligent network trigger; column 18, lines 15- 23; column 112, lines 1 – 5; lines 45 – 52), the method further comprising the step of pausing call processing at said switch following activation of said trigger; and sending a message to a service control point (recited “Service Control Point (SCP) as a service control point) located in said public switched telephone network, the service control point performing said accessing the Internet Protocol network database (column 112, lines 1 – 5; lines 45 – 52).

Regarding claims 10, 14, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said Internet Protocol network database (recited “ a physical entity connecting to the Transport Networks through Network Interfaces. Examples of these are ACP, EVS, SIP” as accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) to contact a device column 54, lines 60 – 64).

Regarding claim 11, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein said telephone switch is a gateway switch which interconnects said public telephone network with the Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, column 23, lines 30 – 34), the method further comprising, for calls completed to said Internet Protocol telephony device operating the gateway switch to generate Internet Protocol packets corresponding to said telephone call (Fig.

10A; column 23, lines 30 – 34; lines 51 – 67); and transmitting said generated Internet Protocol packets to the Internet Protocol network for delivery to said Internet Protocol telephony device (column 85, lines 13 – 17; column 92, lines 50 – 58).

Regarding claim 13, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein said device in said Internet Protocol network which is contacted is a domain name server (recited “Internet Domain Name System” as device in said Internet Protocol network which is contacted is a domain name server; column 81, lines 16 – 19).

3. Claims 12, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. (US 6909708 B1) and Kung et al. (US 6678265 B1) as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 11, 13 above, and further in view of Foti et al. (US 6917612 B2).

Regarding claim 12, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of a method of servicing a telephone call directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device coupled to an Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, elements 1021,1050; column 84, lines 40 – 57), Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database (column 92, lines 50 – 58). However, Krishnaswamy et al. and Kung et al. do not disclose expressly the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Enum to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database. Foti et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Enum to contact a device in said

Art Unit: 2616

Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database (recited “converts an input E.164 number to a domain name in ENUM format” as accessing said database includes using Enum to contact a device; column 4, lines 12 – 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy et al. and Kung et al. to include a method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Enum to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database such as that taught by Foti et al. in order to have a system and method of address resolution in IP-based networks that provides a uniform methodology for address resolution (as suggested by Foti et al. , see column 3, lines 17 – 20).

Regarding claim 15, Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the limitation of a method of servicing a telephone call directed to an Internet Protocol telephony device coupled to an Internet Protocol network (Fig. 10A, elements 1021,1050; column 84, lines 40 – 57), Krishnaswamy et al. disclose the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database (column 92, lines 50 – 58). However, Krishnaswamy et al. and Kung et al. do not disclose expressly the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol ENUM to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database. Foti et al. disclose the limitation of the method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol ENUM to contact a device in said Internet Protocol

Art Unit: 2616

network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database (recited “utilizes SIP for call setup and converts an input E.164 number to a domain name in ENUM format” as accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol ENUM to contact a device; column 4, lines 12 – 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy et al. and Kung et al. to include a method of claimed wherein the step of accessing said database includes using Session Initiation Protocol ENUM to contact a device in said Internet Protocol network which is responsible for retrieving information from said database such as that taught by Foti et al. in order to have a system and method of address resolution in IP-based networks that provides a uniform methodology for address resolution (as suggested by Foti et al., see column 3, lines 17 – 20).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 are allowed over prior art.

Claims 6, 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/20/2006 with respect to claims 1 – 15, 23 – 28 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2616

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ACL

June 08, 2006


Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner